



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION 10  
1200 Sixth Avenue  
Seattle, Washington 98101

April 14, 2008

Reply To  
Attn Of: ECO-088

Ref: 05-002-NOA

Helen Farr  
NOAA – Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management  
1305 East-West Highway, SSMC 4, N/ORM  
Silver Springs, MD 20910

Dear Ms. Farr:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for **Amendment No. 4 Incorporation of Revised Washington Shoreline Management Act Guidelines into the Federally Approved Washington Coastal Management Program** (CEQ #20080071) in accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Section 309, independent of NEPA, specifically directs EPA to review and comment in writing on the environmental impacts associated with all major federal actions and the document's adequacy in meeting NEPA requirements.

The draft PEIS proposes to amend the Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE) Washington Coastal Zone Management Program (WCZMP) to incorporate revised guidelines (Washington Administrative Code [WAC] 173-26) requiring Shoreline Master Programs (SMPs) to be consistent with new guidelines for shoreline growth. The new guidelines would help achieve improved water quality, scenic beauty, safer development, achieve no net loss of ecological functions, make improvements to existing shoreline environments, focus attention on 'critical' areas and ensure that activities not requiring a permit, meet Shoreline Management Act (SMA) policy goals.

The PEIS provides two action alternatives. Alternative 1, the Preferred Alternative, would approve WDOE's request to incorporate WAC 173-26 as an amendment to the WCZMP. Alternative 2 would deny WDOE's request to incorporate WAC 173-26. If Alternative 2 was implemented, the WCZMP would not meet the Coastal Zone Management Act and other Federal laws. The No Action Alternative would be the absence of agency action, and under the CZMA, if the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) did not act on the state's

proposed amendment, the amendment would eventually be conclusively presumed as approved. Thus, the No Action Alternative would have the same effect as Alternative 1.

We have assigned a rating of LO (Lack of Objections) to the draft EIS. This rating and a summary of our comments will be published in the Federal Register. A copy of the rating system used in conducting our review is enclosed for your reference.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this draft EIS. If you have any questions or would like discuss our findings, please contact Mike Letourneau at (206) 553-6382 or feel free to contact me at (206) 553-1601.

Sincerely,

/s/

Christine B. Reichgott, Manager  
NEPA Review Unit

Enclosure